

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 12-31 were pending in this application. No claims have been amended, added or canceled. Hence, claims 12-31 remain pending. Reconsideration of the subject application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,923,744 to Cheng, *et al.* (hereinafter “Cheng”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of all claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), since the office action does not cite a reference that teaches all the claim limitations, either expressly or inherently as required for a proper 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection. Claim 12 recites:

12. A method for routing calls comprising:  
at a service switching point associated with a subscriber line having switched-based call forwarding to voicemail associated therewith and having a specific digit string associated therewith, detecting an Off-Hook Delay trigger, wherein the Off-Hook Delay trigger includes a forward-to number; suspending call processing to the forward-to number; sending an infocollected message to a service control point associated with an Advanced Intelligent Network, wherein the infocollected message includes the specific digit string and the forward-to number; comparing the forward-to number to a voicemail number associated with the subscriber line; and based on the comparison determining whether to resume call processing to the forward-to number.

The underlined portions are not taught by Cheng.

Cheng, at col. 7, ll. 1-4, appears to teach an Off-Hook Delay trigger, and at col. 3, ll. 25-31, appears to teach call forwarding. But Cheng does not teach an Off-Hook Delay trigger that includes a forward-to number. Moreover, Cheng does not teach suspending call forwarding to the forward-to number, sending an infocollected message that includes the forward-to number and the specific digit string, comparing the forward-to number to a voicemail, and, based on the comparison, determining whether to resume call forwarding to the forward-to number. The

office action asserts that these limitations are taught at col. 3, ll. 10-31. This is simply not the case.

At col. 3, ll. 10-31, Cheng appears to teach processing IN features. Cheng does not, however, teach how IN features (e.g., forward-to) are coordinated with certain switch-based features (e.g., switched-based call forward to voicemail). This is clear in light of the absence of the claimed features that provide this coordination, at least with respect to the subject features.

More specifically, Cheng teaches no means by which a forward-to number is transmitted for comparison to a voicemail number, nor does Cheng teach the actual comparison. Cheng also mentions nothing about resuming call processing based on the comparison. Hence, for at least the foregoing reasons, Cheng fails to anticipate claim 12.

Claim 27 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 12 and is believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above. The remaining claims depend from one of these independent claims and are believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reasons.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 9, 2006

/Irvin E. Branch/  
Irvin E. Branch  
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
IEB:arl  
60886049 v1